



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/597,376	07/14/2008	Mark Avis	P-US-CS-1162	1016
28268	7590	12/28/2009		EXAMINER
THE BLACK & DECKER CORPORATION				NASH, BRIAN D
701 EAST JOPPA ROAD, TW199			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TOWSON, MD 21286			3721	
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		12/28/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/597,376	Applicant(s) AVIS, MARK
	Examiner Brian Nash	Art Unit 3721

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(o).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 July 2008.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 7-21 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 July 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-166/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Examiner's Comments

1. The Examiner notes that the office action below may reference support found in the cited prior art by indicating element numbers, figures or by pointing out a specific paragraph (PAR) number in which support can be found. The PAR number referenced corresponds to paragraph number beginning in the "Detailed Description" of the disclosure unless otherwise noted.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is in claim format and contains legal terms and should instead be a narrative description of the invention. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

4. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the disclosure is missing descriptive sub-headings, i.e. BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION, BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION, BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS, and DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claims 7-21 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim must refer back to the independent claim in the alternative only AND a multiple

Art Unit: 3721

dependent claim cannot serve as the basis for another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n).

Accordingly, the claims 7-21 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 21 is indefinite because it is not clear what applicant is claiming or what structural limitations are encompassed by the claim. Specifically, it cannot be determined what claim 21 further defines in the invention. Appropriate correction is required.

8. A claim limitation will be presumed to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph, if it meets the following 3-prong analysis:

- (A) the claim limitations must use the phrase "means for" or "step for;"
- (B) the "means for" or "step for" must be modified by functional language; and
- (C) the phrase "means for" or "step for" must not be modified by sufficient structure, material>,< or acts for achieving the specified function.

9. Claim 1 is not found to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph since the phrase "first vibration attenuating means" fails to meet the 3-prong analysis for the reason underlined above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a

Art Unit: 3721

patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 2004/0216907 to

Happ et al.

With respect to claims 1-5, Happ et al discloses a power tool having a housing, a motor within for actuating work on a tool, and a vibration attenuating means (flanges 53,54 of boot 51,fig. 3) for attenuating vibrations transmitted from stator to the housing. The vibration attenuating means are made of a resilient material (PAR 27-28,31) circumferentially spaced around the axis of the rotor in an opposing, i.e. offset, configuration (fig. 3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 2004/0216907 to Happ et al. Happ et al disclose the invention substantially as claimed, but disclose the vibration attenuating means to comprise a resilient material rather than a leaf spring. Happ et al further disclose the thickness of the resilient material can be changed for the purpose of damping vibrations similar to the function of increasing layers of the leaf spring in applicant's invention. Leaf springs are common and well known in the art and it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use leaf springs in place of the resilient material since applicant has not disclosed that the material used for attenuating vibrations solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with either design choice.

Art Unit: 3721

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Refer to attachment (PTO-892) for notice of references cited and recommended for consideration based on their disclosure or limitations of the claimed invention.
15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Nash whose telephone number is 571-272-4465. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m.
16. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I. Rada can be reached at 571-272-4467. The official fax number for this Group is: 571-273-8300
17. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained form the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. For more information about the PAIR system, see www.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Brian D. Nash/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3721

12/21/2009